

work laws give workers a choice. Choice creates competition, and competition breeds success. Forced unionization creates a monopoly, which only leads to stagnation.

President Biden says he believes that “every worker should have a free and fair choice to join a union,” but the PRO Act would tip the scales towards unionized labor even further. Among other things, the bill requires that workers’ personal contact information be sent to unions; removes vote by secret ballot, subjecting them to union harassment; and limits the information workers may receive during a union-organizing campaign. That doesn’t sound free and fair to me; it sounds like they want to ensure a favorable outcome for the union bosses and give them the ability to punish workers who don’t go along with them.

On a related note, I want to briefly mention the upcoming unionization vote for nearly 6,000 workers at Amazon’s facility in Bessemer, AL, just outside of Birmingham. There has been a lot of attention paid to this lately. We have had Hollywood actors, celebrities, Members of Congress, and even President Biden trying to help tip the scales toward the union’s favorable outcome. Let me be clear. These hard-working Alabamians don’t need Hollywood elites or Federal Government officials telling them what to do. We should all trust they will make the decision they think is right for them and their families. And that is what right-to-work is all about—the right to choose. This is still a free country, after all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the crisis that is affecting our country right now, and it is the crisis at our southern border. Later this week, I will travel to Texas to inspect the situation firsthand.

My Republican colleagues and I will first say thank you to our law enforcement officers who are there on the frontlines. Their work is always important, and it is especially important at this time.

The President said on Sunday that he hopes to visit the border. He said he hopes to visit the border “at some point.” Well, with all due respect, the American people don’t have time to wait. I invite the President to join us this Friday. Come with us. See the situation. Witness it firsthand.

Here are the facts. In the month of February, Federal agents apprehended more than 100,000 illegal immigrants crossing our southern border. That is more than double the number from last February. So in just 28 days—28 days of February—over 100,000 illegal immigrants crossed our border.

You know, illegal immigration numbers usually go down in the winter. It rises in the spring and peaks in the

summer. We have every reason to expect that this is only going to get much worse in the months ahead. Even the Biden administration admits it. They admit that we are on pace this year to have more illegal immigrants than any year over the last 2 decades.

Why is this happening? Well, if you ask the migrants, they will tell you the answer. His name is Joe Biden. There are photographs of migrants near Tijuana wearing shirts that say: “BIDEN PLEASE LET US IN!”

They even use the Biden logo—his campaign logo—on their shirts.

So when did the surge of illegal immigrants start? Well, just after President Biden took office on January 20. Before the month was over, President Biden had already issued over seven Executive actions on immigration alone.

As I detailed on the floor a couple of weeks ago, President Biden has unveiled the most leftwing immigration agenda in the history of our Nation. During the campaign last year, President Biden promised lavish taxpayer benefits for illegal immigrants. So did Vice President HARRIS.

When the moderators at the Democratic debates asked who supported free healthcare for illegal immigrants, President Biden raised his hand. Vice President HARRIS also endorsed free healthcare for illegal immigrants. President Biden promised not just amnesty but American citizenship for illegal immigrants, and 26 Democrat Senators have already signed onto the bill that he has proposed.

President Biden said in February that he will even give the coronavirus vaccine to illegal immigrants. You come here illegally; you get a free vaccine against coronavirus and free healthcare. No wonder illegal immigrants are rushing to our borders.

But we all remember what happened 4 years ago after President Trump was elected. Before he even issued most of his immigration policies, illegal immigration plummeted. It went down by 40 percent the first 4 months of his Presidency. It was called “The Trump Effect.” It happened even before his policies went into effect. It was because he sent a clear message to the world. He said: Don’t come here illegally or we will send you right back home. That message was heard around the world.

Now we are getting very different messages from this Biden White House. As a result, we have “The Biden Effect,” which is the exact opposite of what “The Trump Effect” did. We are having historic increases in illegal immigration. They are promising free healthcare, free education, free vaccines, offering amnesty, and even citizenship for illegal immigrants.

Democrats just passed a bill that lets illegal immigrants get \$1,400 checks. Senator COTTON and I tried to stop it. Every Democrat in the U.S. Senate voted against our amendment. They voted to give hard-earned taxpayer dollars to people who aren’t even in the country legally.

The White House says publically that we will not expel any illegal immigrants under the age of 18. That is what they have said publicly. The White House Press Secretary even mocked that idea. As a result, massive numbers of teens and children are crossing the border.

Secretary Mayorkas has told the whole world that if you are under 18, you get a free pass. He went on television last week and said: “We will not expel your child. . . . We will care for that child and unite that child with a responsible parent.”

In that same interview, he said: “I hope [children] will not undertake that perilous journey” to our border.

But as long as liberal policies are in place, it is a guarantee. They will undertake the perilous journey. They will risk traveling at the hands of smugglers, cartels, and human traffickers to get here.

Now we have a system that is overwhelmed. Our border agents can’t keep up. Immigration and Customs Enforcement just spent \$86 million to rent hotel rooms—hotel rooms for families who illegally crossed the border; \$86 million for hotel rooms for over 1,000 families.

It has been reported that more than 100 illegal immigrants who tested positive for the coronavirus have been released into Texas. They were told to quarantine after they traveled through the country to their preferred destination in the United States. We don’t know where they are now or how many people they infected along the way. It could be in Texas. It could be anywhere. It is very concerning to people all across the country, and yet the White House is still in denial.

In fact, last week, the White House Press Secretary had to correct herself. She accidentally used the word “crisis” when talking about the border. A reporter asked her if that meant the White House was finally acknowledging that it was a crisis. She said no. She said it was just a “challenge.”

Joe Biden promised us he would always tell us the truth. Yet the Biden White House is trying to mislead the American people about one of the most important issues that is facing our country today. It is not working. The American public knows this is a crisis. Democrats may think that this is some political game. In reality, this is a humanitarian crisis. Thousands of children are being harmed because of this.

Liberals talk a lot about how much compassion and empathy they feel. The truth is, the policies that they have don’t lead to compassionate outcomes. They lead to some very cruel outcomes. As Secretary Mayorkas admits, the journey north from Central America is a “perilous” one. It is not safe for children. Large numbers of children who make the journey are trafficked, sexually assaulted, or recruited by gangs. If this year is like previous years, thousands and thousands of children are going to be harmed because

they make the journey north. There is nothing compassionate about the open border policy of this administration.

It didn't have to happen. It should not have happened, and the blame rests squarely with President Biden and the open-border Democrats. In less than 2 months, President Biden has already shown himself the most open-borders President in our history as a Nation. It is no surprise that the whole world has noticed.

This crisis will not fix itself. We need to take action. Republicans have a series of commonsense solutions to improve this situation immediately. They include enforcing the law, securing the border, and restoring the policy called "Remain in Mexico." Without these, the Biden border crisis is going to continue to undermine our Nation's safety and its security.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and then, after me, Senators LEAHY and PETERS be allowed to complete our remarks in their entirety before the scheduled vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, the debate about the legislative filibuster is not a debate about S. 1 or S. 101 or S. 901. No, this is a debate about nothing less than the nature and durability of American self-government. Quite apart from the wrestling over which particular bill was filibustered 8 years ago or 4 years ago or 2 years ago or tomorrow, the decision about whether or not to eliminate the filibuster is the Senate's most important policy debate in decades.

Eliminating the filibuster would obviously have all kinds of policy consequences, from tax rates and labor law to energy and infrastructure. But that is not why the debate is so important. This isn't fundamentally a debate about this or that policy.

The debate about the filibuster is deeper than that because it is a debate about how and whether we debate at all. This matters a whole lot in a country this big, in a continental nation, because it is right at the heart of how peaceable self-government works at all. If we just blow that up, if we act as if it is just a matter of time before the filibuster goes away and all we really have is red-versus-blue jerseys anyway, if we just end the Senate's rules as they have existed for 240 years, we will dramatically alter not just this institution but our entire form of self-government, and in the process we will dramatically escalate the fevered pitch of America's recent arguing.

We shouldn't ignore the deep and long-term significance of what setting the Senate's rules on fire would mean simply because terms like "super-majority requirement" don't fit really neatly into our modern, made-for-

cable-TV, soap-opera variety of politics as entertainment, politics as sport, even politics as religion. "Super-majority requirements" are a whole bunch of syllables, and it just doesn't make for great sound bites.

But make no mistake. If we set the Senate's rules on fire, we are going to cause dramatic, horrible consequences in American civic life.

Almost every single Member of the newly minted Democratic majority in the Senate has resolved in recent weeks that the legislative filibuster needs to be abolished, or, in their most recent focus group term, to be "reformed" out of existence.

This move would be directly contrary to over two centuries of tradition in this country and in this body. It would be directly contrary to the Founders' explicit purposes for why this institution was created at all, and it would be directly contrary to the words of dozens and dozens of the majority Senators—their words just in the last 48 months.

This is no mere procedural change. If they go through with this, an already sick Senate would be committing institutional suicide. There really is no reason to be a U.S. Senator if the Senate doesn't exist to foster real debate that is bigger than simple majority power.

This nuclear trigger would all but destroy the principle of consensus-building that the Senate demands and, thereby, all but ensure that minority rights in this country would become subject to more and more fickle, more and more power hungry, and, inevitably, more and more abusive simple majorities.

America is built on a number of seemingly small, but actually quite grand, ideas. One of the very best of those ideas, one that is just elegantly simple—so simple that we regularly don't pause to reflect on it together and to teach it to our kids—is the simple idea that whenever possible, groups of different people should be allowed to make different rules for themselves. This is what our system of federalism is about. This is why we divide power both vertically and horizontally between legislative, executive, and judicial branches, and then also across the 50 States and versus the Federal Government.

It is not actually an extravagant thought. Children on a playground kind of instinctively understand that if you can't get one giant game of kickball together, it is OK to let the playground divide up into a few different games of kickball and dodgeball. It is a grand American tradition that when we don't have to agree, we don't have to agree about everything. It is OK to allow some diversity. It is OK for not all workplace regulations to be exactly the same everywhere in the country.

As it happens, America is a really big country, a continental nation, and we regularly don't agree. Californians don't always agree with Nebraskans. Virginians don't always agree with

New Yorkers. People in regularly sunny Miami don't always see the world exactly the same as folks in regularly wintry Boston do. Ohio State fans don't have to wear the blue and gold of Michigan.

It is a big country full of disagreements, and so our principle is, regularly, that wherever we can protect and respect differences, we should. We don't force folks to wear the jerseys of the teams they don't support. There is no reason to.

I feel like there is some joke I should make about Oral Roberts versus Harbaugh—I know relative competitions against Ohio State—but prudence recommends skipping that.

There are also circumstances, obviously, where we need to make big wide-ranging monopolistic government decisions. There are times when we have to have one-size-fits-all rules, but those one-size-fits-all obligations are not for everything. Even in those moments when they are required, we still want to work hard to protect the rights of minorities and dissenters.

So how do we respect their rights and abilities to make rules for varying communities across a nation of 330 million people from shore to shore? How do we allow as many people as possible to make divergent rules as they see fit? One of the ways we have done that traditionally in the Senate is we have always made sure, here, where we come from all across the country—east to west, north to south—that we would be required to pass legislation not by 50 plus 1 but by 50 plus 10.

What that means is that, most all of the time, even if you are in the majority, you can't just do everything you want. You can't just pass one, big, compulsory law immediately without lots of debate, because you rarely have 50 plus 10. You have to bring some people from across the aisle over to your side. If you are in the majority, it means that you have to learn the habit of sitting down with Members of the minority. You have to talk to them. As importantly, you have to listen to them.

When this process of compromise works and a bill is passed, you are then guaranteed that the new law has the stamp of approval of at least some representatives of the minority on that issue, and it means that they will become your allies against quickly undoing that law next year. They will become your allies because the process of compromise has led you to listen to each other and say: Instead of doing the 51-percent thing, what harder work might be required to get to the 60-percent thing?

If the process of compromise breaks down, that is a pretty important signal as well. When you are forced to make rules that are binding on diverse groups of people, it is in everyone's interest that you get as much buy-in as possible. That makes it more likely that the new rule will be respected and followed beyond just this 2-year Congress. Yet, if you shove a rule change